OBLON

SPIVAK

McClelland

MAIER

NEUSTADT P.C.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

ECKHARD H. KUESTERS (703) 413-3000 EKUESTERS@OBLON.COM



Docket No.: 243444US2

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/673,177

Applicants: HIROAKI HAZAMA ET AL

Filing Date: September 30, 2003

For: NONVOLATILE SEMICONDUCTOR MEMORY

DEVICE

Group Art Unit: 2824 Examiner: Nguyen, V.

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

PROVISIONAL ELECTION

Our check in the amount of \$0.00 is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,

MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Eckhard H. Kuesters

Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone) (703) 413-2220 (fax)

DOCKET NO: 243444US2

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF : EXAMINER: NGUYEN, V. HIROAKI HAZAMA ET AL

SERIAL NO: 10/673,177

: GROUP ART UNIT: 2824 FILED: SEPTEMBER 30, 2003

FOR: NONVOLATILE

SEMICONDUCTOR MEMORY DEVICE

PROVISIONAL ELECTION

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the election requirement dated August 11, 2005, Applicants elect Group I, Claims 1-3 and 8, drawn to dummy cell, classified in class 365, subclass 185.2, for further examination on the merits. Applicants reserve the right to file one or more divisional applications directed to the non-elected invention.

Furthermore, while the Election Requirement asserts that the application contains claims to patentably distinct inventions, MPEP \S 803 states the following:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

Although the outstanding Official Action identifies different search classifications, it is believed that the claims of the present application would have to be searched in a handful of sub-classes. Furthermore, since electronic searching is commonly performed, a search may be made of a large number of, or theoretically all, subclasses without substantial additional effort. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the Restriction Requirement on the

Application No. 10/673,177 Reply to Office Action of August 11, 2005

grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner, whereas it would be a serious burden on Applicants to prosecute and maintain separate applications.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the requirement to elect a single group be withdrawn, and that a full examination on the merits of Claims 1-9 be conducted.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,

MAIER)& NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 08/03)

Eckhard H. Kuesters Attorney of Record Registration No. 28,870

I:\atty\EHK\Amend-Responses\0039\24s\243444US-ELECTION.DOC